

Report Review Checklist

1. Study Authority

- a. Does the study conform with the intent of the cited study authority?

2. Scope of Investigation

- a. Have the water resource related problems been fully and clearly evaluated?
- b. Have all significant resource uses been adequately considered?
- c. Have all foreseeable short and long-term needs been adequately considered?

3. Objective of Investigation

- a. Are planning objectives clearly stated?

4. Plan Formulation

- a. Have the assumptions and rationale for the without-project condition been explicitly stated and are they reasonable?
- b. Have all reasonable alternatives, including nonstructural and no-action plans, been adequately addressed?
- c. Have alternatives which are not implementable by the Corps, been fully considered?
- d. For water supply, have a range of measures been adequately considered that can, over time, balance water demand for various purposes with water availability?
- e. Has a justified plan been identified and properly evaluated?
- f. Have a sufficient number of alternatives been analyzed to determine if there is a justified plan?
- g. Is there sufficient rationale for any recommended departure from the NED plan?
- h. Are the reasons for selection of major elements of the recommended plan sound and adequate?
- i. Does the selected plan conform with existing policy? If not, have the reasons for departure been adequately documented?
- j. Would staged construction be appropriate?
- k. Is the selected plan consistent with applicable comprehensive plans for the area?
- l. Have both beneficial and adverse effects been adequately evaluated for the selected plan and alternatives?
- m. Has acquisition of necessary land for future project elements been adequately considered?

5. Cost Allocation

- a. Is the cost allocation in conformance with existing policies?
- b. Has the necessity for sub-allocations been adequately considered?
- c. Have all project purposes been included in the allocation?

6. Cost Apportionment

- a. Is the apportionment of cost to local interests in conformance with present policy and evaluation procedure?
- b. Are there special circumstances associated with the project that warrant consideration of increased non-Federal cost sharing?

7. Coordination

- a. Has there been adequate coordination with appropriate State, local, and Federal agencies, and have their views been considered in formulating the recommended plan?
- b. Has coordination conformed with law, executive orders, and agreements between agencies; and, if not, has the departure been satisfactorily explained?
- c. Have the proper preservation, conservation, historical, and scientific interests been consulted, and were their views given adequate consideration during plan formulation?

8. Public Involvement

- a. Was adequate public involvement conducted during the planning process to fully inform interested parties and to ascertain their views?
- b. Have any international implications associated with the recommended plan been properly addressed?

9. Local Cooperation

- a. Are the items to be furnished by local interests those normally required under the law and by present policy; and, if not, is adequate support given for classifying the items as those to be furnished by local interests?
- b. If recreation or fish and wildlife enhancement are included in multiple-purpose projects, is a letter of intent from non-Federal interests included in accordance with Public Law 89-72?
- c. Have reporting officers established that local interests fully understand and are willing and capable of furnishing the local cooperation specified?
- d. Has the non-Federal sponsor requested special conditions different from provisions in the model LCA, and if so, have these conditions been agreed to by HQUSACE and ASA(CW)?

10. Financial Analysis

- a. Does the report include letter of intent to cost share from the non-Federal sponsor?
- b. Does the non-Federal sponsor's letter of intent to cost share provide evidence of the sponsor's authority to utilize the identified source or sources of funds; and provide information on the non-Federal sponsor's capability to obtain remaining funds, if any?
- c. If the sponsor is relying on third party contributions, does the letter of intent include comparable data for the third party together with evidence of its legal commitment to the sponsor?
- d. If a non-Federal sponsor's financing depends on the contributions of funds by a third party or parties, and the non-Federal sponsor does not have the capability to meet its financial obligations without said contribution, does the report have separate statement of financial capability and financing plan for the contributions for the third party or parties?

11. Policy Aspects

- a. Does the proposed project conform to policies established by law and USACE directives governing Federal participation?
- b. Has the review considered current Administration policies and decisions, as well as directions, actions, and interpretations by OMB and ASA (CW)?

12. Economic Analysis

- a. Has adequate consideration been given to tradeoffs between economic and environmental effects?

- b. Do the combined beneficial economic and environmental quality effects outweigh the combined adverse economic and environmental effects?
- c. Are separable features, including mitigation measures, incrementally justified?
- d. Does the report state the benefit-cost ratio (BCR) for the recommended plan assuming existing conditions prevail over the period of analysis?

13. Annual Charges

- a. Does the interest rate and amortization period conform with present practice?
- b. Has interest during construction been correctly calculated and included in the economic analysis?

14. Benefit Evaluation

- a. Have NED benefits been evaluated in accordance with appropriate guidelines and procedures? If not, are acceptable reasons for deviation from standard procedures furnished?
- b. Is the benefit estimate mathematically correct?
- c. Are the assumptions regarding future alternative conditions clearly stated and justified, and are these assumption reasonable?
- d. Have all known benefits been included in the benefit estimate?
- e. Are the economic projections reasonable?
- f. Have methodologies and assumptions been explained in sufficient detail?
- g. Is the information and data adequate to reasonably support the benefit estimate?
- h. Is the without-project condition reasonable and believable, and does it actually reflect how non-Federal interests will act if the resource under study is not developed?
- i. Have possibilities of windfall benefits and appropriate special cost sharing been thoroughly investigated?
- j. Are average annual benefits on the same time basis as average annual costs?
- k. Have possible negative benefits been adequately considered and evaluated?
- l. If NED employment benefits are claimed, is the area still eligible?
- m. If as a result of investigations between planning and regulatory staffs, it is apparent that an activity to be conducted by a project beneficiary is not in the public interest, have the projected economic benefit(s) associated with that activity been eliminated?
- n. If recreation benefits are claimed, does the report include an adequate description of the competing facilities and their existing and expected future use with and without the proposed project? Also, does the report adequately distinguish between and describe the impacts on peak versus average use in the with and without project conditions.

15. Risk and Uncertainty – Sensitivity Analysis

- a. Have the plans and their effects been sufficiently examined to determine the uncertainty inherent in the data or in the various assumptions of future economic, demographic, social, attitudinal, environmental, and technological trends?
- b. Have the areas of sensitivity been adequately identified and proper analysis performed so that decisions can be made with knowledge of the degree of reliability of available information?
- c. Does the report address the risk and uncertainty of the without-project condition assumptions and does it test for sensitivity?
- d. Have the advantages and costs of reducing risk and uncertainty been adequately considered in the planning process?

Date:

Division/District: POD/POA

16. Environmental Impact Assessment and Mitigation

- a. Have the necessary technical studies and coordination been conducted in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and other applicable environmental laws?
- b. Has mitigation of adverse effects been considered in each alternative plan and evaluated in accordance with appropriate Corps guidelines?
- c. Is the appropriate NEPA document (EA/FONSI or EIS) included in the feasibility report?
- d. Has the NEPA document been developed and coordinated in accordance with ER 200-2-2?
- e. Have the environmental impacts of all reasonable alternatives been properly evaluated and displayed?
- f. Will the activity to be conducted by a project beneficiary necessitate a DA permit, and if so, has the activity been included in the environmental documentation of the project as required by NEPA and the section 404(b)(1) guidelines?